

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 16 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled Claim 17. Thus, no new matter has been added by this amendment. Claims 16, 19, and 20 remain in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendment.

Claims 16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markki (US 2003/0117965) in view of Malki (US 2001/0046223). Applicants, however, strongly disagree and respectfully traverse the rejection.

In short, MPEP § 2141.03 requires that to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Contrary to the Examiner’s statement that Markki in combination with Malki teach the limitations of Applicants’ claimed invention, namely “maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node.” The combination does not. Thus, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended Claim 16 to clarify that the mobile node maintains “a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node.” In Applicants’ amendment dated 24 August 2004, such a limitation was described by cancelled Claim 17 and placed into independent Claim 16, but the placement of the limitation did not clearly state that the limitation was specific to “maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node.” Thus, Applicants’ have rearranged the placement of the limitation to more clearly specify the invention.

The limitation of “maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained

when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node" is not taught or suggested by the combination of Markki with Malki.

Markki relates to supporting mobile routers in a mobile Internet Protocol version 6 environment. Markki, abstract, field of the invention, summary, para. 21, et seq. The whole disclosure is related to teaching the support of mobile routers and how "nodes on the mobile network need not be aware of the mobility of the network." Markki, para 24. In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention requires that nodes on the mobile network require awareness of the mobility of the network by "maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node." The only mention of the mobile node being in a home network is made in Fig. 1 where Fig. 1. of Markki shows a block diagram of a mobile router and a mobile node both at home. However, neither the figure nor the corresponding text teach or suggest the mobile node "maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node."

Malki relates to mobility management and how packets are routed when mobile nodes move from one access router to another access router. Malki, abstract. Malki is related to sending binding update messages to home agents and correspondent nodes when it changes its point of attachment from one access router to another access router, but does not teach or suggest "maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node." Malki, para. 9, para. 10, para 32, para. 42. In contrast, Malki specifically points out that binding update messages are only sent when the mobile node moves from one access router to another access router when the mobile node is not at home. Malki, para. 9, para. 10, para 32, para. 42. Thus, Malki teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention requiring "maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node."

Thus, because this claimed limitation is not taught or suggested by Markki and is not taught or suggested by Malki, Markki in combination with Malki also fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "maintaining a binding update of one or more correspondent nodes that the

mobile node has been communicating with wherein the binding update list is maintained when the mobile node is a home network of the mobile node." Thus, Claim 16 is argued to be allowable over the prior art.

Further, since independent Claim 16 is argued to be allowable over the combination of Markki with Malki, so too are the dependent Claims 19 and 20, as they contain all the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Thus, the rejections of Claims 16, 19, and 20 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Section
Law Department
1303 E. Algonquin Road, Floor 3
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: Indira Saladi
Indira Saladi
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,759
Telephone: 847-576-6735
Fax No.: 847-576-0721
Indira.Saladi@motorola.com